

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,264	04/21/2004	Takeshi Wada	252083US3	4835
22850 7590 02/06/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			MAGEE, CHRISTOPHER R	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
	· · · <del>-</del> · · .			
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		. 02/06/2007	PAPER .	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/828,264	WADA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher R. Magee	2627
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESTRUCTION OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA .136(a). In no event, however, may a repl d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH te, cause the application to become ABAN	ATION.  y be timely filed  S from the mailing date of this communication.  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 c      This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .      Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matter	•
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1-33 is/åre pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-17,22-25 and 30-35)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-8,18-21 and 26-29 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/  Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examin 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the	33 is/are withdrawn from consorted in the second section requirement.  Here as the second se	ed to by the Examiner.
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in Apporting documents have been received in Apporting the control of the cont	olication No eceived in this National Stage
·		
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Sun Paper No(s)/N 5) Notice of Info	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/21/04;9/28/06</u> .	6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/828,264 Page 2

Art Unit: 2627

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species A directed to Figs. 2-10b in the reply filed on 01/16/2007 is acknowledged. However, the Applicant was advised in the Office Action, dated 12/15/2006, that "a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species

that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon,

including any claims subsequently added." MPEP § 809.02(a). Therefore, the Examiner will

examine claims 1-8, 18-21 and 26-29, which are readable on the elected species.

2. Claims 9-17, 22-25 and 30-33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37

CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or

linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 01/16/2007.

#### Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement(s) (IDS) submitted on 4/21/04 and 9/28/06 is/are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner has considered the information disclosure statement.

Art Unit: 2627

## Specification

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1-8, 18-21 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication JP 60-116668 in view of Traskos et al. (hereinafter Traskos) (US 6,574,075 B2).
- Regarding claims 1-4, 18-20 and 26-28, JP 60-116668 shows a head gimbal assembly [Figs. 2(a-c)], comprising:
- a suspension including a multilayered plate member formed by at least three layers laminated together, both side edges of only a part of the layers of said multilayered plate member within a stiffness required region being bent to form ribs; and
- a head slider with at least one head element, said head slider being mounted on said suspension [Figs. 2(a-c)].

Application/Control Number: 10/828,264

Art Unit: 2627

JP 60-116668 is silent regarding the modulus of elasticity of neighbor layers of said at least three layers being different from each other.

Referring to claims 1, 5, 18, 21, 26 and 29 and in the same field of endeavor, Traskos discloses a suspension including a multilayered plate member formed by at least three layers laminated together (i.e., a liquid crystal polymer film disposed between ASTM 302 stainless steel and ASTM C7025 copper alloy foil to form a stack), [col. 6, lines 41-44]. It is well known in the art that these aforementioned materials have different degrees of moduli of elasticity based upon individual material characteristics.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the multilayered suspension member of JP 60-116668 with the materials cited by Traskos.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide the multilayered suspension member of JP 60-116668 with the materials cited by Traskos such that the load beam can have localized blend and flex, and have excellent hygrothermal properties [*Traskos*; col. 2, lines 43-45].

• Referring to claims 6-8, both JP 60-116668 and Traskos do not disclose multiple metal (i.e., more than 3) or resin (i.e., more than 2) layers. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the multilayered suspension member of JP 60-116668 and Traskos with multiple metal (i.e., more than 3) or resin (i.e., more than 2) layers.

Art Unit: 2627

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide the multilayered suspension member of JP 60-116668 and Traskos with multiple metal (i.e., more than 3) or resin (i.e., more than 2) layers in order to duplicate parts for a multiplied effect. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc.* 193 USPQ 8, 11 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1977).

### Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure has been annotated on PTO-892.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Magee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7592. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8: 00 am-4: 30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington can be reached on (571) 272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/828,264

Art Unit: 2627

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher K. Magee Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2627

February 1, 2007 crm

TAN DINH PRIMARY EXAMINER

2/02/17